



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,930	12/30/2003	Jeron Wayne Coolman		7091
31688	7590	06/27/2007	EXAMINER	
TRAN & ASSOCIATES 6768 MEADOW VISTA CT. SAN JOSE, CA 95135			MADAMBA, CLIFFORD B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3609	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/747,930	COOLMAN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Clifford Madamba	3609	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. .

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *January 30, 2006*.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. This action is in reply to Application 10/747,930 filed on January 30, 2003.
2. Claims **1-12** are currently pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 30, 2006 has been considered. An initialed copy of the Form 1449 is enclosed herewith.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims **1, 5, and 7-10** are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Central Contractor Registration (CCR) Information Brochure, December 24, 2004, in view of Ross E. Dworkin, U.S. Patent 4,992,940, in view of Marshall T. Rose et al., U.S. Patent 5,757,917.
6. With regard to claim **1**, CCR discloses a system for paying a vendor for items shipped to a customer comprising:

- *accessing data from a Central Contract Registry (CCR) Database to retrieve vendor payment data* (see at least pages 16-20 and 26-34); and,
- *paying the vendor using the CCR database* (see at least page 9, paragraph 2; pages 33-34, paragraphs 3-10).

CCR doesn't explicitly disclose the limitations of:

- *receiving an order from the customer for items supplied by the vendor*; and,
- *placing the order with the vendor*.

Dworkin, however, teaches where an order is placed with the vendor, which is subsequently received by the vendor (see at least abstract, lines 21-24; column 2, lines 34-36; column 7, lines 66-68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system for paying a vendor for items shipped to a customer, as taught by CCR, with the limitations of *receiving an order from the customer for items supplied by the vendor*; and, *placing the order with the vendor*, as taught by Dworkin, with the motivation of enabling a buyer to effect the purchase of goods or services [Dworkin, Abstract: lines 1-2].

CCR doesn't explicitly disclose the limitation of:

- *receiving an acceptance from the vendor.*

Rose, however, teaches where the vendor exchanges communications with the buyer during a purchase transaction process (see at least column 7, lines 48-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system for paying a vendor for items shipped to a customer, as taught by CCR, with the limitation of *receiving an acceptance from the vendor*, as taught by Rose, with the motivation of having a means for confirming product and/or service availability [Rose: column 7, lines 63-67].

7. With regard to claim 5, CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. CCR doesn't explicitly teach the following limitations:

- *using the CCR data to register vendors;*
- *search and select vendors for solicitation of services and/or delivery of supplies; and,*
- *view vendor profile or Electronic Transfer Funds for outstanding account payable.*

Dworkin, however, teaches a system requiring and accessing information from listed vendors (see at least column 3, lines 65-66; column 6; lines 26-32; column 7, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 13-17; column 10, lines 51-54) as well as means for searching and selecting vendors (see at least column 3, lines 51-54; column 4, lines 58-61; column 5, lines 43-46; column 6, lines 24-32; column 7, lines 43-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by CCR, with the limitations comprising *using the CCR data to register vendors; search and select vendors for solicitation of services and/or delivery of supplies; view vendor profile or Electronic Transfer Funds for outstanding account payable*, as taught by Dworkin, with the motivation of having a means for allowing a user to obtain information about any vendor listed on the system [Dworkin, Abstract: lines 18-21].

8. With regard to claim **7**, CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. CCR further teaches the limitation *wherein the view vendor profile further comprises displaying Business Name; DUNS and CAGE Code; Socio Economic Factors; Business Type; Geographic Location; or NAICS/SIC Code* (see at least pages 26-34).
9. With regard to claim **8**, CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. CCR further teaches the limitation wherein the search vendor profile further comprises receiving as a search parameter one or more of the following: *Business Name; DUNS and CAGE Code; Socio Economic Factors; Business Type; Geographic Location; and NAICS/SIC Code* (see at least pages 26-34).
10. With regard to claim **9**, CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. CCR doesn't explicitly teach the following limitations:
 - *retrieving CCR public data and private data;*
 - *determining the vendor's business name and mailing address from the public data;*
 - *determining the vendor's electronic fund transfer (EFT) information from the private data;*
and,
 - *using the EFT information to pay the vendor.*

Rose, however, teaches wherein data containing the vendor's business name, mailing address and EFT information is retrieved from a two-way partitioned information database and payment system for the purpose of paying a vendor (see at least column 10, lines 31-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by CCR, with the limitations comprising *retrieving CCR public data and private data; determining the vendor's business name and mailing address from the public data; determining the vendor's electronic fund transfer (EFT) information from the private data; and, using the EFT information to pay the vendor*, as taught by Rose, with the motivation of ensuring proper payment processing for the vendor [Rose: column 6, lines 38-41].

11. With regard to claim 10, CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose teach the limitations of claim 9 as described above. CCR doesn't explicitly teach the following limitations:

- *providing vendor payment information to an accounting system;*
- *formatting the payment information to include vendor payment information and an account payable amount; and,*
- *reflecting the payment in the accounting database.*

Rose, however, teaches wherein vendor payment information is provided to a payments and settlement system for processing and eventual payment (see at least column 11, lines 26-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by CCR, with the limitations comprising *providing vendor payment information to an accounting system; formatting the payment information to include vendor payment information and an account payable amount; and, reflecting the payment in the accounting database*, as taught by Rose, with the motivation of having a means for processing payment for the vendor [Rose: column 11, lines 55-57].

12. Claims **2-4** and **6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose, as applied to claim 1, above, and further in view of Andrew McLauchlin, U.S. 6,754,672, as applied to claim 2 above.
13. With regard to claim **2**, CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. CCR doesn't explicitly teach the limitation *comprising keeping a local copy of the CCR database in a system database*. McLauchlin, however, teaches a database system through which users can access information including detailed vendor data, which may be sourced from a CCR system (see at least column 1; lines 37-58; column 6, lines 35-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by CCR, with the limitation *comprising keeping a local copy of the CCR database in a system database*, as taught by McLauchlin, with the motivation of allowing the user to access information from external systems including Federal Government systems [McLauchlin: column 1; lines 57-58].
14. With regard to claim **3**, CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose and further in view of McLauchlin teach the limitations of claim 2 as described above. CCR further teaches the limitation comprising *importing the CCR data* (see at least pages 15-20; 46-54). CCR doesn't explicitly teach the limitation further *comprising importing the CCR data into a public data storage and a private data storage*. Rose, however, teaches a computer system by which wherein vendor information is partitioned two-ways according to degree of sensitivity and content of vendor data (see at least column 3, lines 56-66; column 4, lines 3-9; column 6, lines 51-59; column 7, lines 3-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by CCR, with the limitation further *comprising importing the CCR data into a public data storage and a private data storage*, as taught by Rose, with the motivation of preventing unauthorized access to sensitive and/or confidential vendor information [Rose: column 3, lines 60-64].

Art Unit: 3609

15. With regard to claim 4, CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose and further in view of McLauchlin teach the limitations of claim 3 as described above. CCR doesn't explicitly teach the limitation *wherein the importing further comprises transferring data over a secure protocol*. McLauchlin, however, teaches the use of secure protocols to access information from various application systems including Federal Government systems (see at least column 4, lines 37-65; column 11, lines 61-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by CCR, with the limitation *wherein the importing further comprises transferring data over a secure protocol*, as taught by McLauchlin, with the motivation of having a means of enabling communication among web browsers and servers [McLauchlin: column 4, lines 50-57].
16. With regard to claim 6, CCR in view of Dworkin in view of Rose and further in view of McLauchlin teach the limitations of claim 3 as described above. CCR doesn't explicitly teach the limitation *wherein the vendor registration further comprises validating the vendor's DUNS/CAGE data and Point of Contact data*. Rose, however, teaches wherein qualified vendors are verified (see at least column 8, lines 27-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by CCR, with the limitation *wherein the vendor registration further comprises validating the vendor's DUNS/CAGE data and Point of Contact data*, as taught by Rose, with the motivation of determining whether a participating vendor is qualified [Rose: column 8, lines 27-36].
17. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dworkin in view of Rose, as applied to claim 1, above, and in further view of McLauchlin, as applied to claim 2 above.

18. With regard to claim 11, Dworkin discloses a method for ordering items from one or more vendors qualified in a Central Contract Registry (CCR) database comprising the following limitations:

- *grouping items for a predetermined vendor* (see at least column 7, lines 36-40); and,
- *placing the order with the vendor* (see at least column 8, lines 11-17); and,
- *after acceptance to the items by the customer, paying the vendor* (see at least column 8, 11-17).

Dworkin doesn't explicitly teach the limitation further comprising *paying the vendor through the vendor's private data*. Rose, however, teaches wherein a two-way partitioned database containing sensitive information pertaining to the vendor's payment information is accessed to process payment for the vendor (see at least column 10, lines 31-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by Dworkin, with the limitation comprising *paying the vendor through the vendor's private data*, as taught by Rose, with the motivation of having a means for processing payment for the vendor [Rose: column 11, lines 55-57].

Dworkin doesn't disclose the limitation *paying the vendor through the vendor's private "CCR" data*. McLauchlin, however, discloses a system through which detailed vendor data stored in a CCR system can be accessed for any purpose necessary (see at least column 1, lines 57-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by Dworkin, with the limitation comprising *paying the vendor through the vendor's private CCR data*, as taught by McLauchlin, with the motivation of using detailed data which may only be found or stored in a CCR system [McLauchlin: column 1, lines 57-58].

Art Unit: 3609

19. With regard to claim 12, Dworkin in view of Rose in view of McLauchlin teach the method of claim 11 as described above. Dworkin doesn't explicitly teach the limitation *wherein placing the order further comprises including a fund cite number and a delivery address*. Rose, however, discloses the specification of a means of payment for a purchase transaction (see at least column 5, lines 60-64; column 8, lines 5-11) as well as a delivery address (see at least column 10, lines 40-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methodology, as taught by Dworkin, with the limitation *wherein placing the order further comprises including a fund cite number and a delivery address*, as taught by Rose, with the motivation of having a means of providing information to complete a payment transaction process [Rose: column 11, lines 55-57].

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

- Patrick Byrne, U.S. Pub 2005/0060235, teaches a collaborative commerce hub.
- John King et al., U.S. Patent 5,319,542, teaches a system for ordering items using an electronic catalogue.
- John Doyle, U.S. Patent 5,694,551, teaches a computer integration network for channeling customer orders through a centralized computer to various suppliers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clifford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-270-1239. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:30-5:00 EST Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James A. Reagan can be reached on 571-270-1245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Clifford Madamba
Patent Examiner
June 22, 2007

JAR
JAMES REAGAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER